UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/669,594	09/26/2000	Prasad Raje	004426.P001	5001

8791   7590   09/16/2009
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040

EXAMINER
BASEHOAR, ADAM L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/16/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _01 July 2009_.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _126-129,131-140,142 and 144-154_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _126-129,131-140,142 and 144-154_ is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: The Request for Continued

Examination (RCE) filed 07/01/09.

2.   All previous rejections the claims have been withdrawn as necessitated by

Amendment.

3.   Claims 126-129, 131-140, 142, and 144-154 are pending. Claims 126, 132, and

137, are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this
> title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a
> whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said
> subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 126-129, 131-140, 142, 144-147, and 150-154 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strong (US-6,167,523 12/26/00) in view of

Hitchcock et al (US-7,376,891 05/20/08).

   -In regard to substantially similar independent claims 126, 132, and 137,

Strong teaches a computer-implemented method, server system, and machine-readable

medium comprising:

receiving a form authored by a form authoring tool and containing one or more

input fields (Fig. 2: 210, 245, 280; Fig. 3A-C; 5)(column 1, lines 12-56; column 3, lines

12-47);

parsing, independently of the form authoring tool, the received form to identify

the input fields contained in the received form (column 3, lines 12-47; column 5, lines 1-

4; column 6, lines 23-31; column 8, lines 1-10)(Figs. 3B & 5);

providing, independently of the form authoring tool, a user interface dependent

upon the identified input fields to enable configuration of one or more actions to be

carried out in response to a subsequent specific submission of the form by a third party,

the submission including data input into the input fields by the third party, wherein the

one or more actions are selected from a group of two or more types of actions (column 1,

lines 14-36: "forms may be provided for many different purposes…data processing

program"; column 3, lines 7-47: "performing validation and controlling processing";

column 5, lines 1-4 & 39-54: "registry wizard…assist in registry configuration…multiple

handlers"; column 6, lines 32-49: "first server registry key identifier"; column 8, lines 1-

11 & 32-55: "software program...form of a wizard...automatically...based on user

responses...enters the information required"; column 10, lines 58-67; column 11, lines 1-

5)(Fig. 5: "VALIDATION", "HANDLER1", "HANDLER2");

automatically generating, independently of the form authoring tool, program code

to carry out the one or more actions (column 1, lines 14-36: "forms may be provided for

many different purposes…data processing program"; column 3, lines 7-47: "performing

validation and controlling processing"; column 5, lines 1-4 & 39-54: "registry

wizard…assist in registry configuration…multiple handlers"; column 6, lines 32-49:

"first server registry key identifier"; column 8, lines 1-11 & 32-55: "software

program...form of a wizard...automatically...based on user responses...enters the

information required"; column 10, lines 58-67; column 11, lines 1-5)(Fig. 5:

"VALIDATION", "HANDLER1", "HANDLER2");

     wherein the program code is external to the form and independent of the form

authoring tool (column 1, lines 46-67; column 2, lines 10-15, column 3, lines 11-32,

column 4, lines 62-67; column 5, lines 1-12 & 39-45; column 6, lines 31-42l column 10,

lines 58-67; column 11, lines 1-5)(Figs. 1, 2, 5);

     receiving the specific submission of the form from the third party (column 3, lines

7-47: "remote client")(Fig. 4: 400); and

     executing the program code in response to receipt of the specific submission of

the form from the third party to carry out the one or more actions (column 3, lines 7-47:

"each field...evaluated...one or more data processing programs...are invoked by the data

validation and processing control program to process the input data")(Fig. 4: 420, 435,

450).

     While Strong teaches a user interface for customizing a given form (column 3,

lines 12-47; column 5, lines 1-4; column 6, lines 23-31; column 8, lines 1-10; column 11,

lines 1-5), Strong does not specifically teach wherein the forms stored at the server were

received through a network from an independent authoring tool and wherein the form

could be independently edited.   Hitchcock et al taught wherein forms stored at a third

party server were received through a network from an independent authoring tool and

wherein the form could be independently edited (column 2, lines 10-30; column 4, lines

7-65; column 5, lines 35-55; column 53-61; column 9, lines 1-7: "application description

file can be easily modified…without reprogramming the forms engine"; column 10, lines

48-67; column 11, lines 1-50; column 20, lines 60-67)(Figs. 1 & 15). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the HTML forms

system of Strong to have incorporated the forms functionality as detailed in Hitchcock,

because Hitchcock taught said functionality provided a plurality of well known benefits

(column 2, lines 1-7 & 24-59: "allows data sharing between customizable

forms…extensible data-sharing database…news forms are automatically

populated…stored in a way that allows…user information to be changed without

reprogramming"; column 8, lines 1-6; column 14, lines 56-67: "reduces the requirements

for the browser...less computation is performed").

In regard to dependent claims 127, 134, 138, Strong teaches wherein the form

was written in HTML (column 3, lines 7-31)(Fig. 2: "HTML form").

In regard to substantially similar dependent claim 128, 135, 139, Strong

teaches wherein the generated program code was a CGI program (column 1, lines 25-67;

column 5, lines 39-45: "CGI").

In regard to dependent claims 129 and 140, Strong teaches modifying the form

such that the specific form submission is directed/associated to the generated program

code (column 5, lines 1-4 & 49-52; column 6, lines 32-49; column 8, lines 1-10; column

10, lines 58-67; column 11, lines 1-5)(Fig. 3B: 350).

In regard to dependent claims 131, 136, and 142, Strong teaches automatically determining whether the generated program code is consistent with the form and generating an alert if the generated program code is not consistent with the form (column 7, lines 32-40)(Fig. 4: 405, 410).

In regard to dependent claim 133, Strong teaches a processor implementing the parser module, configurer module, and the code generation module (Figs. 1, 2, & 4).

In regard to dependent claim 144, Strong teaches validating that submission data is consistent with constraints for the form input fields as configured in the GUI (column 1, lines 40-67; column 3, lines 8-46: "validation", column 8, lines 28-52).

In regard to dependent claim 145, Strong teaches generating one or more quantities computed from data in the specific submission (column 1, lines 12-19; column 8, lines 28-55; column 10, lines 5-45).

In regard to dependent claim 146, Strong teaches generating one or more licenses in response to the specific submission of the form (column 1, lines 12-19; column 6, lines 6-15; column 8, lines 28-55; column 10, lines 5-45)(Fig. 3A).

In regard to dependent claim 147, Strong teaches generating one or more cookies for each user who submits a specific submission of the form (column 1, lines 12-19; column 6, lines 6-15; column 8, lines 28-55; column 10, lines 5-45)(Fig. 3A).

In regard to dependent claims 150-151, Strong teaches generating response pages/preserving a state of data to the third party upon receipt of the specific submission form, wherein the response page, having one or more fields in common with the first form, depends on the value of submission data provided by the third party in the form input fields and wherein the response page contains one or more strings of fixed text and one or more strings that are dependent on the submission data (column 1, lines 12-37; column 3, lines 37-47; column 10, lines 13-50)(Fig. 7).

In regard to dependent claims 152-154, Strong a plurality of different form functions and a plurality of processing handlers for processing the data submitted on the form (column 1, lines 12-18: "gathering…information…creating guest books"; column 5, lines 39-53; column 6, lines 7-14; column 8, lines 1-56; column 10, lines 54-67; column 11, lines 1-5)(Fig. 5). Strong does not specifically teach wherein the function of the form was to log values for data submitted in the specific submission of the form in a database in a single row of a table, different submission corresponding to different rows of the table. Hitchcock et al taught wherein the function of an HTML form could be to log values for data submitted in the specific submission of the form in a database in a single row of a table, different submission corresponding to different rows of the table (column 9, lines 32-67: " a first database table…each attribute, such as Name…SAT score…is represented by one row…User Attributes Table"; column 10, lines 5-34: "User Attribute Sent Table…multiple records"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the processing functionality of one of the forms in

Strong to have been to store data as shown in Hitchcock et al, because Hitchcock et al

taught that said data storage functionality provided the ability of extensible data sharing

between customizable forms (column 2, lines 1-7 & 24-59: "allows data sharing between

customizable forms...extensible data-sharing database...news forms are automatically

populated...stored in a way that allows...user information to be changed without

reprogramming").

6.   Claims 148-149 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Strong (US-6,167,523 12/26/00) in view of Hitchcock et al (US-7,376,891 05/20/08) in

further view Whitmyer (US-5,895,468 04/20/99).

        In regard to dependent claims 148-149, Strong teaches entering a valid email

address into a HTML form (Fig. 3A) and returning one or more elements of data from the

specific form submission of the form and including in the message one or more strings of

fixed text and one or more strings that are dependent on the submission data (column 1,

lines 12-37: "provide for the output...displayed to the client...from which the form was

submitted"; column 3, lines 37-47; column 10, lines 13-50)(Fig. 7). Strong does not

specifically teach wherein the returned form specific message was returned to the client

by emailing said form based on said entered email address. Whitmyer teaches wherein

an action based on a form submission resulted in a response message being emailed back

to a given user and/or third party (column 4, lines 31-67: "response form...by email...and

generate a reply email....computer network, etc"; column 5, lines 1-6 & 43-60; column 6,

lines 40-50: "automatically generating a confirmation email based on the

action...transmitting...to the client computer"). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the output message of Strong to

have been returned to the client of Strong via an email as shown in Whitmyer, because

email was a notoriously well known method at the time of the invention by which

information could quickly/easily be passed over a network between devices as well as

because Whitmyer taught that said functionality provided the benefit of improving the

speed, efficiency, and reliability of performing services for clients (column 2, lines 15-

35: "speed…reliability").

Response to Arguments

7.   Applicant's arguments with respect to the independent claims have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

       Please note the additionally cited prior art on the accompanying PTO-892 Form.

9.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to ADAM L. BASEHOAR whose telephone number is

(571)272-4121. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:00am - 5:00pm.

       If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Steve Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call

800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Adam L Basehoar/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178